

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated July 24, 2008.

Claims 1, 3, 4-12, 14-23, and 25-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen et al. (2001/0030663 A1), and Oosterholt et al. (2001/0008399), and further in view of Kinnunen et al. (2001/0021649). Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 1, 12, and 23 provide, in part, that a control unit, configured to control at least a display control unit, automatically stores reference information linked to past-referred to data stored in the communication terminal in a normal operation mode of the communication terminal when the past-referred to data was referred to, and the control unit automatically stores the URL address of a past-referred to file in the communication mode of the communication terminal when the past-referred to file was referred to.

In support of the rejection of independent claims 1, 12, and 23, the Examiner alleges that Nielsen et al. discloses a control unit, processor 18, which is configured to control a display control unit, LCD driver 13, (Office Action, page 3, lines 8-10; page 7, lines 9-10). The Examiner further alleges that a built-in phone book in Nielsen et al. reads on past-referred to data stored in the phone, (Office Action, page 3, lines 18-19; page 7, lines 4-15), that Oosterholt et al. discloses web pages equivalent to a past-referred to file or data, (Office Action, page 5, lines 2-3; page 9, lines 7-8), and that Kinnunen et al. discloses that a URL address of a past-referred to file was automatically stored by a control unit in a communication mode of the communication terminal when the past-referred to file was referred to, (Office Action, page 6, lines 4-10; page 10, lines 9-14).

First, Applicant respectfully submits that it does not appear that paragraph [0017] of Kinnunen et al., cited by the Examiner in support of the allegation that the URL address of the past-referred to file was automatically stored in the communication mode of the communication terminal when the past-referred file was referred to, is supported by paragraph [0017] of Kinnunen et al. There appears to be no disclosure, teaching, or suggestion in the cited portion of Kinnunen et al. that the URL address of the past-referred to file was stored in the communication mode of the communication terminal when the past-referred to file was referred to.

Second, the Examiner does not appear to contend that the control unit: (1) is configured to control at least the display control unit, (2) stores reference information linked to past-referred to data in a normal operation mode of the communication terminal when the past-referred to data was referred to, and (3) stores the URL address of a past-referred to file in the communication mode of the communication terminal when the past-referred to file was referred to. All three functions of the control unit mentioned in the previous sentence are specified in independent claims 1, 12, and 23. In contrast, the Examiner alleges that Nielsen et al. merely discloses that a control unit is configured to control at least a display control unit, but nowhere alleges that the control unit also performs the functions of storing the reference information and the URL address of a past-referred to file, as provided by independent claims 1, 12, and 23.

Since each of claims 3-11, 14-22, and 25-33 is directly dependent upon one of independent claims 1, 12, and 23, each of claims 3-11, 14-22, and 25-33 is allowable for at least the same reasons recited above with respect to the allowability of the appropriate one of independent claims 1, 12, and 23.

In view of the foregoing remarks, allowance of claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-33 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON OCTOBER 23, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



MAX MOSKOWITZ
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700